	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Notice of Allowability	10/784,374	TAKACSI-NAGY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JUE WANG	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to *2/4/2010*.

2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are *1, 3, 18, 20, 43-61 (renumbered as 1-23)*.

3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some*   c) ☐ None   of the:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the

           International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.

    (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached

        1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.

    (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of

        Paper No./Mail Date _____.

    Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
    Paper No./Mail Date _____

4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material

5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6. ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413),
    Paper No./Mail Date *20100329* .

7. ☒ Examiner's Amendment/Comment

8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

9. ☐ Other _____.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193

Inventorship

1.   In view of the papers filed 2/4/2010, it has been found that this nonprovisional

application, as filed, through error and without deceptive intent, improperly set forth the

inventorship, and accordingly, this application has been corrected in compliance with 37

CFR 1.48(a). The inventorship of this application has been changed by the addition of inventor

Michael Blevins.

The application will be forwarded to the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) for

issuance of a corrected filing receipt, and correction of Office records to reflect the inventorship

as corrected.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

2.   An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or

additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR

1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the

payment of the issue fee.

3.   Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with

Adam Hipp (Reg No. 60,334) on March 18, 2010.

4.   The claims have been amended as follows:

a.   Claim 1: replace claim 1 with the following:

1.   A method for extending an existing object oriented programming language, comprising the steps of:

extending an existing object oriented programming language with a workflow language including a plurality of workflow constructs provided as markup language commands;

selecting a program source file including a source code and classes written in the existing object oriented programming language;

extending the source code with a workflow definition including the plurality of workflow constructs of the workflow language, wherein the workflow constructs are specified in the form of annotations to the source code and the classes, the plurality of workflow constructs including an action construct representing an activity that allows a first software component to call an operation on a second software component; and

using a workflow program according to the workflow definition, including

processing, using a computer including a processing device operating thereon, the action construct to allow the first software component to call the operation on the second software component, and

passing, according to the workflow definition in the form of annotations to the source code, information selected from one or more files, documents and/or tasks between system resources, according to a set of procedural rules to generate activities at the computer as defined by the workflow definition.

b.   Claim 2 is canceled.

c.   Claim 18, replace claim 18 with the following:

18.   A computer system capable of extending an existing programming language, comprising:

a computer including a processing device operating thereon;

a program source file stored on a computer readable storage medium, wherein the program source file includes a source code and classes written in an existing object oriented programming language, wherein the existing object oriented programming language is extended with a workflow language including a plurality of workflow constructs provided as markup language commands;

a workflow definition including the plurality of workflow constructs of the workflow language, wherein the workflow constructs are specified in the form of annotations to the source code and the classes, the plurality of workflow constructs including an action construct representing an activity that allows a first software component to call an operation on a second software component; and

object code executed by the processor, the object code configured to

use a workflow program according to the workflow definition, including processing, using a computer including a processing device operating thereon, the action construct to allow the first software component to call the operation on the second software component, and

pass information selected from one or more files, documents and/or tasks between system resources, according to a set of procedural rules to generate activities at the computer as defined by the workflow definition specified in the form of annotations to the source code and classes.

d.   Claim 19 is canceled.

e.   Claim 61, replace claim 61 with the following:

61.   A computer readable storage medium including instructions stored thereon which when executed cause the computer to perform the steps of:

extending an existing object oriented programming language with a workflow language including a plurality of workflow constructs provided as markup language commands;

selecting a program source file including a source code and classes written in the existing object oriented programming language;

extending the source code with a workflow definition including the plurality of workflow constructs of the workflow language, wherein the workflow constructs are specified in the form of annotations to the source code and the classes, the plurality of workflow constructs including an action construct representing an activity that allows a first software component to call an operation on a second software component; and

using a workflow program according to the workflow definition, including

processing, using a computer including a processing device operating thereon, the action construct to allow the first software component to call the operation on the second software component, and

passing, according to the workflow definition in the form of annotations to the source code, information selected from one or more files, documents and/or tasks between system resources, according to a set of procedural rules to generate activities at the computer as defined by the workflow definition.

Reasons for Allowance

5.   The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest extending an object oriented programming language with a workflow language including a plurality of workflow constructs provided as markup language commands, selecting a program source file including a source code and classes written in the existing object oriented programming language; extending the source code with a workflow definition including a plurality of workflow constructs of the workflow language, wherein the workflow constructs are specified in the form of annotations to the source code and the classes.

6.   The prior art of record, Christensen teaches a method of extending an existing object

oriented programming language with constructs provided as markup language commands. The

prior art of record, Meredith teaches a markup language based workflow language that includes

an action construct. The prior art of record, Peltz teaches extending Java source code by

definitions specified in the form of annotations to the source code. However, Christensen,

Meredith, and Peltz fail to teach the independent claim as recited where the existing object

oriented programming is extended with a workflow language including a plurality of workflow

constructs provided as markup language commands, and extending the source code with a

workflow definition including a plurality of workflow constructs of the workflow language,

wherein the workflow constructs are specified in the form of annotations to the source code and

the classes.

7.   Any comment considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the

payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue

fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for

Allowance."

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jue S. Wang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1655. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30 am - 5:00pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on 571-272-3759. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./   /Jue S Wang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193   Examiner, Art Unit 2193